## REMARKS

Claims 1-43 are pending. Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 10, 24, 32 and 43 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-9, 11-23, 25-31 and 33-42 under 35 U.S.C. §102 or §103 in light of U.S. Patent No. 5,870,454 (Dahlen), U.S. Patent No. 5,193,110 (Jones) and U.S. Patent No. 5,479,488 (Lennig), as applicable. Applicant requests reconsideration of the pending claims in light of the following remarks.

### A.     Overview

The pending application has been through extensive examination to date. In past Office Actions, the Examiner has rejected the pending claims under §102 and/or §103 in light of various combinations of the Lemelson, Srinivasan, Jones and Lennig patents. In response to a number of the prior Office Actions, Applicant has distinguished the applied prior art at least on the basis that the applied prior art did not show or suggest a system or method that involves recording a verbal "destination party identity" and "destination address type," both spoken by a calling party, and using the destination party identity and destination address type to query a database for an appropriate "destination address" for the called party. In prior Office Actions, the Examiner has relied upon Lemelson and Srinivasan as allegedly disclosing these recited elements. The Examiner has now withdrawn his reliance on Lemelson and Srinivasan, and, instead, relies upon Dahlen as allegedly disclosing these features. Applicant respectfully submits that Dahlen does not disclose these recited claim elements.

10

Docket No.: 00-VE09.16A

## B.    The Pending Claims

Each of the pending claims is directed to or includes a system or method for accessing a destination party address based upon a destination party address type provided by a calling party. In an exemplary embodiment described in the specification of the pending application, a calling party (a person sending a message) audibly specifies a destination party identification (such as a person's name) and a destination party address type (such as, "email", "voice mail", "facsimile", "beeper", etc.). Based upon these two pieces of information, a database is queried to retrieve a corresponding destination party address (e.g., an email address, a telephone number, a facsimile number, a beeper number, etc.). The retrieved destination party address may be used for various purposes, depending upon the various embodiments of the invention, such as to send a message to the device (e.g., email, voice mail, facsimile, beeper, etc.) associated with the identified person (the destination party). Thus, in each of the pending claims, both a destination party *identification* and a destination party *address type* (both audibly provided to the system) are used to query a database to retrieve the appropriate destination party *address* to send the message. None of the cited prior art references teach this concept.

Independent claim 1 recites:

> A voice processing unit configured for recording a *destination party identity* and *a destination address type, spoken by calling party*, for a corresponding message;

> A speech recognition unit for outputting data corresponding to identified words spoken by the calling party; and

> A master control unit configured for *generating a destination address query for an identified directory database in response to identification of the destination party identity and the destination address type* by the speech recognition unit, wherein the master control unit, in response to receiving a destination address reply from the identified

11

directory database, selectively initiates a transfer of the message to the
destination party based on the destination address reply.

(emphasis added). Thus, in claim 1, a calling party speaks a destination party identity (such as,

for example, a person's name) and a destination address type (such as, for example, "email",

"voice mail", "facsimile", "pager", etc.). A destination address is retrieved based upon the

destination party identity and the destination address type. Further, in claim 1, a message is sent

to the destination address.

Independent claim 16 recites:

> a central office switching system configured for receiving a line-sided
> connection with a calling party;

> a unified message platform system comprising a speech recognition
> unit for identifying *a destination party identity and a destination
> address type based on respective speech samples supplied by the
> calling party* via the line-sided connection, the unified message
> platform *outputting a destination address query based on the
> destination party identity and the destination address type*;

> a directory database for storing destination addresses for respective
> destination parties based on destination address type, *the directory
> database generating a directory response based on reception of the
> destination address query*; and

> *a data network for transporting the destination address query and the
> directory response between the unified message platform system and
> the directory database according to a prescribed data network
> protocol.*

(emphasis added). Thus, claim 16 recites generating a directory response based upon a

destination party identity and a destination party address type, both of which being audibly

supplied by the calling party. Claim 16 further recites a data network that transports the

destination address query and directory response between the message platform and the database.

12

Independent claim 25 recites a method that includes the steps of "processing speech

samples spoken *by the calling party* on the line-sided connection *to identify a destination party*

*and a destination address type...* and *accessing a directory database via a data network for*

*retrieval of the destination address corresponding* to *the destination party and the destination*

*address type.*" Similarly, independent claim 35 recites a unified message platform system,

including, among other things, "*a directory access system for accessing destination address*

*information for the destination party based on the corresponding destination address type...*"

Therefore, claims 25 and 35 both recite a accessing a destination address from a directory

database or access system based at least upon a destination address type.

### C.     Dahlen

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-9, 11-23, 25-31 and 33-42 under §102 in light of

Dahlen alone or under §103 in light of Dahlen as modified by either Jones or Lennig, as

applicable. The Examiner relies upon Dahlen as teaching all of the elements of independent

claims 1, 16, 25 and 35, including receiving an audible destination party identification and

destination type, and using those pieces of information to query a database to retrieve a

destination address. Applicant submits that Dahlen does not disclose or suggest those features.

At the outset, Dahlen is directed to solving an entirely different problem from that of the

pending application. Dahlen is directed to a system that enables a voice caller to provide a

textual message to a called party. *See,* e.g., Dahlen, col. 1, lines 38-39; Abstract. In contrast, the

pending application is directed to a system that, among other things, enables a voice caller to

access address information from a database for a destination party based at least in part upon the

type of message to be sent, which eliminates the need for the calling party to have to provide the

destination address (e.g., telephone number, email address, facsimile number, etc.) to the system.

13

As a result of solving a different problem, Dahlen fails to disclose or suggest the elements of the pending claims.

Specifically, Dahlen fails to disclose or suggest that a caller audibly conveys a destination party identification and a destination type, which are then used to query a database to retrieve a destination address. Rather, the Dahlen system requires that the calling party "enter the destination identifier(s) of the called party(ies)." *See,* Dahlen, col. 5, lines 45-47. "Destination identifier(s)" include the directory number or internet number of the called party. *See,* Dahlen, col. 8, lines 10-13. Therefore, in Dahlen, the calling party must <u>enter</u> a destination identifier, such as a directory number or internet number, which is used to direct the message to an appropriate destination location. Dahlen does <u>not</u> teach a system that permits a calling party to speak a destination identity and a destination type and then use those pieces of data to query a database to retrieve a destination address. Indeed, there is no need for Dahlen to access a database to retrieve a destination address in order to send a message because, in Dahlen, the calling party enters the destination identity directly.

For at least this reason, all of the pending claims are allowable over the cited prior art.

**D.     Additional Reasons for Allowing Many of the Claims**

In addition to the reason set forth above, upon which all of the pending claims should be allowed, several of the claims are allowable for additional reasons. For example, 2-14, 15-34, 37-43 all recite that the query to the directory database and the subsequent reply with the destination address are made over a data network or an interoffice signaling network configured for exchanging data, as applicable. Dahlen does not teach or suggest making any queries to a directory database over a <u>data network</u> to retrieve a destination address.

14

Docket No.: 00-VE09.16A

Therefore, this is an additional reason why claims 2-14, 15-34, 37-43 are allowable over the cited prior art.

15

Docket No.: 00-VE09.16A

## CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are distinguished over the cited prior art and are otherwise in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or issues relating to Applicants' response, or believes that any formal matters require clarification, the Examiner is cordially encouraged to telephone the undersigned Applicants' representative.

Any fees associated with the filing of this paper should be identified in an accompanying transmittal. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 07-2347, under Order No. 00-VE09.16A, from which the undersigned is authorized to draw. To the extent necessary, a petition for extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made, the fee for which should be charged to the above account.

Dated:   June 23, 2005                          Respectfully submitted,

By_____
Joel Wall
   Registration No.: 25,648
Attorney for Applicants

VERIZON CORPORATE SERVICES
   GROUP, INC.
c/o Christian Andersen

600 Hidden Ridge Drive
Mailcode HQE03H14
Irving, TX 75038
Telephone: 972-718-4800

Customer No.: 32127

16